

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/782,015	02/12/2001	Edmund Y.M. Chein	00115P002D	2156	
8791	7590 11/29/2005		EXAM	EXAMINER	
	SOKOLOFF TAYLOF	R & ZAFMAN	GUPTA, ANISH		
12400 WILSH SEVENTH FI	IRE BOULEVARD		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
	ES, CA 90025-1030		1654		

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
09/782,015	CHEIN, EDMUND Y.M.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Anish Gupta	1654	

•		7					
	Anish Gupta	1654					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 05 October 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.							
☑ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:							
	e period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I	The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN						
TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 7	TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension for have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2 set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely final reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  NOTICE OF APPEAL							
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp	oliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	ns of the date of				
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since							
a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed	I within the time period set forth in 3	37 CFR 41.37(a).					
AMENDMENTS							
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection,			ecause				
<ul> <li>(a)</li></ul>	•	TE below);					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be		ducing or simplifying	the issues for				
appeal; and/or	tter form for appear by materially re	duding or ompmying					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.					
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.1	16 and 41.33(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1	21. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment	(PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)	<b>)</b> :	•					
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a	llowable if submitted in a separate,	timely filed amendme	ent canceling the				
non-allowable claim(s).  7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is pro The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected:  Claim(s) with drawn from consideration:		ll be entered and an e	explanation of				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE							
<ol> <li>The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, be because applicant failed to provide a showing of good an was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).</li> </ol>	ut before or on the date of filing a N d sufficient reasons why the affiday	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> vit or other evidence is	ot be entered s necessary and				
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appe y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(	ils to provide a 1).				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	n of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.				
<ul> <li>11.          ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.</li> </ul>	ut does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowa	nce because:				
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).							
13. Other:	, ·	- <del></del>					
	July 1						
PRIMARY EXAMINER	ANISH GUPTA PRIMARY EXAMINED						
	- A ABILIACH						

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendment raises issues under 112 Second paragraph. .

Continuation of 11: does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Appplicants raise nearly identical points as raised in the arguments prior to Final office action. Those arguments were addressed in final office action. Again it is stressed that it does not matter what the intended use of the kit is in this application or the prior art, so long as the products are identical. Here, the products are identical including the dosage regiment, as pointed out in the office action dated 5-27-04, and thus the claims are anticipated.

Rejections are maintained.

ANISH GUPTA
PRIMARY EXAMINER